THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.188 of 2007

Dated: 05.01.2007

Between:

K. Srinivasa Rao.

..... PETITIONER

AND

Union of India through the Secretary, New Delhi,
and others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO

WRIT PETITION No.188 of 2007

ORDER:

Petitioner No.1 is the Secretary of VTPS Fly Ash Brick Manufacturers Association. Petitioner No.2 is yet another Association espousing the case of Fly Ash Building Materials Manufacturers. This writ petition is filed essentially seeking a direction to respondent No.3 to implement the orders of the Government in G.O.Ms.No.127, Energy (Power.I) Department dated 29.09.2006, whereunder respondent No.2 ordered to supply not less than 50 % of fly ask production of every thermal power station in the State for the purpose of utilisation by Fly Ash Brick Manufacturing (SSI) Units at free of cost.

It is the case of the petitioners that in spite of such directions, respondent No.2 is diverting fly ash to large cement manufacturers, that respondent No.3 is forcing the petitioners associations and their members to pay Rs.10/- per metric ton of fly ash as voluntary contribution for VTPS Colonies Welfare Association and that there is threat of removal of hydra mix systems [CMS11]installed by the petitioners for loading of fly ash from the storage bits of respondent No.3.

At the stage of admission itself, the learned standing counsel for the Andhra Pradesh Power Generation Corporation submits that as there is a short fall in the lifting of fly ash by various brick manufacturers, respondent No.3 has approached respondent No.2 for necessary modification as there is a huge accumulation of fly ash in the fly ash bits. He also submits that the allegation that the petitioners or the members of the petitioners associations are denied supply of fly ash is not correct and respondent No.3 is always willing to supply fly ash to the needy brick manufacturers as per the orders of the Government in G.O.Ms.No.127 dated 29.09.2006. All other allegations are denied by him. Therefore, instead of keeping the writ petition pending, the same is disposed of recording the submissions of the learned standing counsel and further observing that if the petitioners have any grievance in the matter of implementation of G.O.Ms.No.127 dated 29.09.2006, they may seek redessal before respondent No.2. No costs.

_____

(**V.V.S.RAO, J**)

05th January, 2007

ghn

[CMS11]